arXiv:1702.05642v1 [math.OC] 18 Feb 2017

Verification theorems for stochastic optimal control problems in Hilbert spaces by means of a generalized Dynkin formula

Salvatore Federico* Fausto Gozzi†

February 21, 2017

Abstract

Verification theorems are key results to successfully employ the dynamic programming approach to optimal control problems. In this paper we introduce a new method to prove verification theorems for infinite dimensional stochastic optimal control problems. The method applies in the case of additively controlled Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, when the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation admits a *mild solution* (in the sense of [12]). The main methodological novelty of our result relies on the fact that it is not needed to prove, as in previous literature (see e.g. [20]), that the mild solution is a *strong solution*, i.e. a suitable limit of classical solutions of the HJB equation. To achieve our goal we prove a new type of Dynkin formula, which is the key tool for the proof of our main result.

Key words: Stochastic optimal control, infinite dimensional HJB equations, Dynkin's formula, transition semigroups, verification theorems, optimal feedbacks.

AMS classification: 93E20 (Optimal stochastic control); 70H20 (Hamilton-Jacobi equations); 65H15 (Stochastic partial differential equations); 49L20 (Dynamic programming method); 49N35 (Optimal feedback synthesis).

Acknowledgements. The authors are sincerely grateful to Franco Flandoli, Ben Goldys and Mauro Rosestolato for fruitful discussions on Theorem 6.2 and Remark 6.3.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Preliminaries **4**
2.1 Spaces and notation 4
2.2 G-derivative 6

3 Formulation of the stochastic optimal control problem **7**

4 Generalized Dynkin's formula **11**
4.1 Transition semigroups, generators and G-derivatives 11
4.2 Proof of the generalized Dynkin's formula 16

5 HJB equation, verification theorem and optimal feedbacks **19**
5.1 Verification theorem 20
5.2 Optimal feedback controls 22

*Dipartimento di Economia Politica e Statistica, Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena (Italy). Email: salvatore.federico@unisi.it.

†Dipartimento di Economia e Finanza, LUISS University, Rome (Italy). Email: fgozzi@luiss.it.

6 Examples **23**
6.1 Problem setup 23
6.2 Infinite dimensional setting 24
6.3 HJB equation and verification theorem 25
6.4 Optimal Feedback Controls 28

1 Introduction

In this paper we introduce a new technique, based on a generalized Dynkin formula, to prove verification theorems for stochastic optimal control problem over infinite horizon in Hilbert spaces.

Verification theorems are key results to enable to solve in a closed way optimal control problems through the dynamic programming approach. Once a solution (in some sense to be precised) of the associated HJB equation is known to exists, the verification theorem provides a sufficient (sometimes also necessary) condition of optimality, which can be used to find optimal controls in feedback forms through the so called closed loop equation. In the stochastic case, when the solution v is sufficiently smooth, the proof of such theorem is substantially based on an applying the Dynkin formula to the function v and to the state process. In our framework of discounted time-homogeneous infinite horizon problems, the dependence on time is known, so the HJB equation is elliptic and v only depends on the state variable. Hence, in the finite dimensional case, to employ the classical Dynkin formula, it is needed to know that $v \in C^2$. Fortunately, in the finite dimensional case, due to the presence of a powerful regularity theory (at least for nondegenerate second order HJB equations) there is a wide class of problems for which actually v is known to enjoy this regularity, hence the classical Dynkin formula applies and the verification theorem can be proved. On the other hand, if v is not known to be sufficiently smooth (i.e. when v is known to be only a viscosity solution), still in the finite dimensional case, other techniques have been developed to overcome the fact that the classical Dynkin formula is not applicable. We mention the following techniques.

- The technique developed in [24], dealing with *viscosity solutions*. In this case, the classical Dynkin formula is applied to test functions and only some weak results are obtained.

- The technique developed in [30]. Here a solution $v \in C^1$ is obtained through the solution of a suitable backward SDE (BSDE). This technique applies to semilinear HJB equations and provides the verification theorem as a byproduct of the construction itself of the solution v. The latter feature is particularly meaningful, as it allows to completely bypass the problem of the second order regularity of v and the application of the classical Dynkin formula. On the other hand, the powerfulness of this approach is partly limited by the fact that it can be applied only when a *structural condition* is verified by the control operator.

- The technique developed in [23]: here v is studied and treated as a *strong solution*, i.e. as a suitable limit of classical solutions.

When the state space H is infinite dimensional the situation is much worse. First of all, the regularity needed to apply the classical Dynkin formula (see, e.g., [8, Sec. 4.4]) is very demanding and does not allow to deal with many applied examples proposed and only partly studied in the literature. This is partly due to additional regularity assumptions on the coefficients needed in infinite dimension, partly due to the lack of a satisfactory regularity theory in infinite dimension. Hence, elaborating alternative methods is considerably more important than in the finite dimensional case. Clearly, the first attempt consists in trying to extend the techniques developed in the finite dimensional case to infinite dimensional one. On this side, so far the state of the art can be basically depicted as follows.

(a) There are no results concerning the case when v is a viscosity solution.

(b) Results with the BSDE approach have been elaborated in various papers, see e.g. [16] in the infinite horizon case, but always under the structural condition. The latter requirement leaves out the treatments of important cases like boundary control of stochastic PDEs or delayed control of SDEs.

(c) Results dealing with strong solutions are available in [22] and in [3].

The results we provide here are closer, in the conclusions, to the results mentioned in item (c) above. With respect to them, ours have a larger range of applicability and, not only in this sense, can be seen as a significant improvement of this technique, as we will comment more precisely afterwards.

We now illustrate the results and the novelties of our paper. We consider a class of stochastic optimal control problems in Hilbert spaces where the noise is additive and the control only appears in an additive form in the drift term:

$$dX(t) = AX(t)dt + GL(u(t))dt + \sigma dW(t). \tag{1.1}$$

Here A, G, L are suitable coefficients, $u(\cdot)$ is the control process, W is a Browian motion, and the state process X takes values in a Hilbert space H. The stochastic control problem consists in minimizing, over a set of admissible control processes, a cost in the form

$$J(x;u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} l(X(s)), u(s))ds\right],$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a discount factor and l is a suitable real valued function. In this case the associated HJB equation is an elliptic semilinear PDE in the space H:

$$\lambda v(x) - \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,[\sigma\sigma^* D^2 v(x)] + \langle Ax, Dv(x)\rangle + F_0(x, D^G v(x)) = 0,$$

where F_0 is a nonlinear function. Under reasonable assumptions, it is proved in [12] that such HJB equation admits a unique mild solution v, i.e. a solution of a suitable integral form of the above equation and that, for such solution, the G-gradient[1], $D^G v$, is well defined; i.e., the minimal differentaibility requirement to give a sense to the nonlinear Hamiltonian term is verified. Once one proves the existence of a mild solution v to the associated HJB equation, the approach of item (c) above would require three nontrivial technical steps: first, proving that such a mild solution is indeed a strong solution (limit, in a suitable sense, of classical solution); second, applying Dynkin formula to the approximating classical solutions; third, passing to the limit the Dynkin formula. As one may expect, passing through all these steps requires additional hypotheses that may be nontrivial to check in practice (see e.g. [22]). Our goal here is to bypass these steps through an alternative path. In fact, we show that the role of strong solutions is not essential. We indeed prove a generalized (abstract) Dynkin formula — deserving interest in itself — which can be directly applied to mild solutions. The proof is quite involved and this is the reason why we consider here the case of stochastic control of equation of type (1.1), where the uncontrolled part of the state equation is of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type[2]. Then, relying on this formula, we

[1] Here G is the operator appearing in front of $L(u)$ in (1.1).

[2] It is worth to stress that, even if in the case of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck dynamics the approach of strong solutions has already been succesfully applied (see [22]), the method used here, other than being original, seems to be extendable to more general structures of state equations, where the strong solution approach would fail. In particular, the employment of the recent theory of C_0-sequentially equicontinuous semigroups in locally convex spaces [13] seems to be promising towards this goal.

straightly prove a verification theorem. The new results on G-derivatives provided in [12] enable us to apply our method to more general examples than the ones treated by the current literature; in particular, to cases where the structural condition required at item (b) above is not verified (see Section 6).

The main results of the paper are the abstract Dynkin formula (Theorem 4.16); the verification theorem (Theorem 5.5); the consequent Corollary 5.7 on sufficient optimality conditions for control processes in feedback form. Concerning the existence of the latter control processes, we do not provide general results on existence of them, as such results strongly depend on the specific case at hand; in Section 6 we deal with a specific example — the optimal boundary control (of Neumann type) of the stochastic heat equation — and comment on results of this kind.

We stress the fact that our method to prove the verification theorem is a novelty also in finite dimension. In this sense, our results may be useful to treat also finite dimensional problems where only partial regularity properties of the value function are known. Here we focus on the infinite dimensional case wher the application is more meaningful.

The paper is organized as follows. After some preliminaries in Section 2 on spaces, notation and the notion of G-derivative recently extended in [12], we introduce our family of control problems in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to prove our new Dynkin formula (Theorem 4.16), the methodological core of the paper. In Section 5 we prove our main results on the control problem: in Subsection 5.1, the verification theorem (Theorem 5.5); in Subsection 5.2, Corollary 5.7 on optimal feedbacks. Section 6 is devoted to the aforementioned example on boundary control of the stochastic heat equation.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we provide some preliminaries about spaces and notation used in the rest of the paper and recall from [12] the notion of G-derivative. We restrict the treatment of G-derivative to the case of real valued functions defined on Hilbert spaces and to constant operator maps G. This will be enough for the purposes of the present paper. For a more general theory and more details we refer to the aforementioned paper [12].

2.1 Spaces and notation

Measurable bounded and continuous functions. All the topological spaces are intended endowed with their Borel σ-algebra, denoted by $\mathscr{B}$. By measurable set (function), we always intend a *Borel* measurable set (function). If U is a topological space and V is a topological vector space, we denote by $B_b(U,V)$ the set of bounded measurable functions from U to V and by $C_b(U,V)$ the set of bounded continuous functions from U to V. If V is complete, the spaces $B_b(U,V)$ and $C_b(U,V)$ are Banach spaces when endowed with the norm

$$|\varphi|_0 = \sup_{x\in U} |\varphi(x)|_V. \tag{2.1}$$

Hilbert spaces. Let H be a Hilbert space. We denote its norm by $|\cdot|_H$ and its inner product by by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H$. We omit the subscript if the context is clear and if $H=\mathbb{R}$. If a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$, converges to $x\in U$ in the norm (strong) topology we write $x_n \to x$.

We denote by H^* the topological dual of H, i.e. the space of all continuous linear functionals defined on H. We always identify H^* with H through the standard Riesz identification.

Linear operators. Let H,K be real separable Hilbert spaces. We denote by $\mathscr{L}(H,K)$ the set of all bounded (continuous) linear operators $T: H\to K$ with norm $|T|_{\mathscr{L}(H,K)} := \sup_{x\in H, x\neq 0} \frac{|Tx|_K}{|x|_H}$,

using for simplicity the notation $\mathscr{L}(H)$ when $H = K$. Moreover, we denote by $\mathscr{L}_u(H,K)$ the space of closed densely defined and possibly unbounded linear operators $T : \mathscr{D}(T) \subseteq H \to K$, where $\mathscr{D}(T)$ denotes the domain. We recall that $\mathscr{D}(T)$ is a Hilbert space when endowed with the graph norm $|x|_{\mathscr{D}(T)} = |x|_H + |Tx|_K$. The range of an operator $T \in \mathscr{L}_u(H,K)$ is denoted by $\mathscr{R}(T)$. Clearly, $\mathscr{L}(H,K) \subseteq \mathscr{L}_u(H,K)$. Given $T \in \mathscr{L}_u(H,K)$, we denote its adjoint operator by $T^* : \mathscr{D}(T^*) \subseteq K \to H$.

We denote by $\mathscr{L}_1(H)$ the set of trace class operators, i.e. the operators $T \in \mathscr{L}(H)$ such that, given an orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of H, the quantity

$$|T|_{\mathscr{L}_1(H)} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle (T^*T)^{1/2} e_k, e_k \rangle_H$$

is finite (see [35, Sec. VI.6]). The latter quantity is independent of the basis chosen and defines a norm making $\mathscr{L}_1(H)$ a separable Banach space. The trace of an operator $T \in \mathscr{L}_1(H)$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Tr}[T]$, i.e. $\mathrm{Tr}[T] := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle Te_k, e_k \rangle_U$. The latter quantity is finite and, again, independent of the basis chosen. We denote by $\mathscr{L}_1^+(U)$ the subset of $\mathscr{L}_1(H)$ of self-adjoint nonnegative (trace class) operators on H. Note that, if $T \in \mathscr{L}_1^+(H)$, then $\mathrm{Tr}[T] = |T|_{\mathscr{L}_1(U)}$.

We denote by $\mathscr{L}_2(H,K)$ (subset of $\mathscr{L}(H,K)$) the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from H to K, i.e the spaces of operators such that, given an orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of H, the quantity

$$|T|_{\mathscr{L}_2(H)} := \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |Te_k|_K^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

is finite (see [35, Sec. VI.6]). The latter quantity is independent of the basis chosen and defines a norm making $\mathscr{L}_2(H)$ a Banach space. It is actually a Hilbert space with the scalar product

$$\langle T, S \rangle_{\mathscr{L}_2(H,K)} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle Te_k, Se_k \rangle_K,$$

where $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is any orthonormal basis of H.

Stochastic processes. Let $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions. Given $p \in [1, +\infty)$, $T > 0$ and a Hilbert space U, we denote by $\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ the set of all (equivalence classes of) progressively measurable processes $X : [0,T] \times \Omega \to U$ such that

$$|X(\cdot)|_{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)} := \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E}|X(s)|_U^p ds \right)^{1/p} < +\infty.$$

This is a Banach space with the norm $|\cdot|_{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)}$. Next, we denote by $\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,loc}(U)$ the space of all (equivalence classes of) progressively measurable processes $X \in \mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ such that $X|_{[0,T]\times\Omega} \in \mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ for every $T > 0$. Given p, T, U as above, we denote by $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ the set of all (equivalence classes of) progressively measurable processes $X \in \mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ such that

$$[0,T] \to L^p(\Omega, U), \quad t \mapsto X(t)$$

is continuous. This is a Banach space with the norm

$$|X(\cdot)|_{\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)} := \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \left(\mathbb{E}|X(s)|_U^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Next, we denote by $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,loc}(U)$ the space of all (equivalence classes of) progressively measurable processes $X : [0,+\infty) \times \Omega \to U$ such that $X|_{[0,T]\times\Omega} \in \mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ for every $T > 0$. We also say that elements of $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(U)$ and $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,loc}(U)$ are "p-mean continuous".

2.2 G-derivative

Here we provide the notion of G-derivative for functions $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$, where H is a Hilbert space. The latter notion is considered in [12] when G is a map $G : U \to \mathscr{L}_u(Z,U)$, with U,Z Banach spaces. Here we restrict to the case of constant G.

Recall that, if $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$, the Fréchet derivative of f at x (if it exists) is the (unique) linear functional $Df(x) \in H^* \cong H$ such that

$$\lim_{|h|_H \to 0} \frac{|f(x+h) - f(x) - \langle Df(x), h\rangle_H|}{|h|_H} = 0.$$

Definition 2.1 (G-derivative)**.** *Let H,K be Hilbert spaces, let $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$ and $G \in \mathscr{L}_u(K,H)$. We say that f is continuously G-Fréchet differentiable at $x \in H$ (briefly, G-differentiable at $x \in H$) if there exists $D^G f(x) \in K^* \cong K$ (clearly, if it exists, then it is unique), called the G-derivative of f at x, such that*

$$\lim_{k \in \mathscr{D}(G), |k|_K \to 0} \frac{|f(x+Gk) - f(x) - \langle D^G f(x), k\rangle_K|}{|k|_K} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

We denote by $C_b^{1,G}(H)$ the space of all maps $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$ such that f is continuously G-differentiable over H, i.e. such that f is G-differentiable at each $x \in H$ and the map $D^G f : H \to K$ belongs to $C_b(H,K)$. In the special case $K = H$ and $G = I$, we simply use the standard notation $C_b^1(H)$.

Remark 2.2. *Note that, in the definition of the G-derivative, one considers only the directions in H selected by the image of G. When $K = H$ and $G = I$ it reduces to the Fréchet derivative, i.e. $Df = D^G f$. Clearly, if f is G-differentiable at x, then it is also G-Gateaux differentiable at x, in the sense that*

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{f(x+tGk) - f(x)}{t} = \langle D^G f(x), k\rangle_K, \quad \forall k \in \mathscr{D}(G); \tag{2.3}$$

moreover, the limit above is uniform in $k \in \mathscr{D}(G) \cap B_K(0,R)$, for every $R > 0$. Conversely, if there exists $k' \in K$ such that

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{f(x+tGk) - f(x)}{t} = \langle k', k\rangle_K, \ \text{uniformly in } k \in \mathscr{D}(G) \cap B_K(0,R), \ \forall R > 0, \tag{2.4}$$

then f is G-differentiable at $x \in H$ and $D^G f(x) = k'$.

The notion of G-derivative allows to deal with functions which are not Gateaux differentiable, as shown by the following example.

Example 2.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(x_1,x_2) := |x_1|x_2$. Clearly, f does not admit directional derivative in the direction $(1,0)$ at the point $(x_1,x_2) = (0,1)$. On the other hand, if we consider $G \in \mathscr{L}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cong \mathbb{R}^2$, defined by $G = (0,1)$, then f admits G-Fréchet derivative at every $(x_1,x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.*

Remark 2.4. *Clearly, if f is Fréchet differentiable at some $x \in H$ and $G \in \mathscr{L}(K,H)$, it turns out that f is G-Fréchet differentiable at x and*

$$D^G f(x) = G^* Df(x). \tag{2.5}$$

Also, if f is Fréchet differentiable and G-differentiable at some $x \in H$, then $Df(x) \in \mathscr{D}(G^*)$ and (2.5) *holds true. Indeed, we get by Fréchet differentiability*

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \frac{f(x+sGk) - f(x)}{s} = \langle Df(x), Gk\rangle_H, \quad \forall k \in \mathscr{D}(G).$$

On the other hand, by G-Fréchet differentiability we also have

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{f(x+sGk)-f(x)}{s}=\langle D^G f(x),k\rangle_K,\quad \forall k\in\mathscr{D}(G).$$

Hence

$$|\langle Df(x),Gk\rangle_H|=\left|\left\langle D^G f(x),k\right\rangle_K\right|\le\left|D^G f(x)\right|_K|k|_K,\quad \forall k\in\mathscr{D}(G).$$

It follows what claimed.

If G is genuinely unbounded, a function $f:H\to\mathbb{R}$ may be Fréchet-differentiable at some $x\in H$ and yet not G-Fréchet differentiable there, as shown by the following example.

Example 2.5. *Let H,K be Hilbert spaces, let $G:\mathscr{D}(G)\subseteq K\to H$ be a closed densely defined genuinely unbounded linear operator on H, and let $G^*:H\to K$ be its (unbounded) adjoint. Next, let $f:U\to\mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(x):=\frac{1}{2}|x|_H^2$. Clearly, f is Fréchet differentiable at every $x\in H$ and $Df(x)=x$. On the other hand, if f was also G-differentiable at every $x\in H$, by Remark 2.4 it would follow $x\in\mathscr{D}(G^*)$ for every $x\in H$, i.e. $\mathscr{D}(G^*)=H$, a contradiction.*

3 Formulation of the stochastic optimal control problem

We are concerned with the optimal control of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process valued in a Hilbert space H. Precisely, let H,K,Ξ three real separable Hilbert spaces, let $(U,|\cdot|_U)$ be a real Banach space and let $\Lambda\subseteq U$ be measurable and endowed with the σ-algebra induced by $\mathscr{B}(U)$, the Borel σ-algebra of U. Let $(\Omega,\mathscr{F},\{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{t\ge 0},\mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions, let $W=(W_t)_{t\ge 0}$ be a Ξ-valued cylindrical Brownian motion (see [8, Ch. 4]), and consider the controlled SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX(t)=[AX(t)+GL(u(t))]dt+\sigma dW(t), & t\ge 0,\\ X(0)=x, \end{cases}\tag{3.1}$$

where the control process $u(\cdot)$, taking values in Λ, belongs to a suitable space of admissible controls and the coefficients A,G,L,σ satisfy the following assumptions, which will be standing and not repeated throughout the paper.

Assumption 3.1.

(i) $A:\mathscr{D}(A)\subseteq H\to H$ *is a closed densely defined linear operator generating a C_0-semigroup $\{e^{tA}\}_{t\ge 0}$ in the Hilbert space H.*

(ii) $\sigma\in\mathscr{L}(\Xi,H)$, $e^{sA}\sigma\sigma^*e^{sA^*}\in\mathscr{L}_1(H)$ *for all $s>0$, and there exists $\gamma\in(0,1/2)$ such that*

$$\int_0^t s^{-2\gamma}\mathrm{Tr}\left[e^{sA}\sigma\sigma^*e^{sA^*}\right]ds<+\infty\quad\forall t\ge 0.$$

(iii) $G:\mathscr{D}(G)\subseteq K\to H$ *is a closed densely defined*[3] *linear operator such that $e^{sA}G:\mathscr{D}(G)\to H$ can be extended for every $s>0$ to a continuous linear operator defined on K that we denote by $\overline{e^{sA}G}$. Moreover, there exists $C_G>0$, $a_G\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\beta\in[0,1)$ such that*

$$|\overline{e^{sA}G}|_{\mathscr{L}(K,H)}\le C_G[s^{-\beta}\vee 1]e^{a_G s}\quad\forall s>0.\tag{3.2}$$

[3]The assumption that G is densely defined can be done without loss of generality, as one can always restrict K to $\overline{\mathscr{D}(G)}$.

(iv) $L:\Lambda\to K$ *is measurable and* $|L(u)|_K\le C_L(1+|u|_U)$ *for some* $C_L>0$.

Remark 3.2. *Since for every* $t>0$ *and* $s\ge 0$ *the operators* $\overline{e^{(s+t)A}G}$ *and* $e^{sA}\overline{e^{tA}G}$ *belong to* $\mathscr{L}(K,H)$ *and coincide on the dense subset* $\mathscr{D}(G)\subseteq K$*, we have*

$$\overline{e^{(s+t)A}G}=e^{sA}\overline{e^{tA}G},\ \ \forall t>0,\ \forall s\ge 0.$$

This implies that the map $(0,+\infty)\to\mathscr{L}(K,H)$, $s\mapsto\overline{e^{sA}G}$ *is strongly continuous, i.e.* $s\mapsto\overline{e^{sA}G}x$ *is continuous for each* $x\in H$.

We now take

$$p\in\left(\frac{1}{1-\beta},+\infty\right),\tag{3.3}$$

which will be fixed in the rest of the paper. We consider, as space of admissible controls, the space of processes

$$\mathscr{U}_p:=\left\{u:\Omega\times[0,+\infty)\to\Lambda\text{ prog. meas. and s.t. }\int_0^t\mathbb{E}|u(s)|_U^p ds<+\infty\ \forall t\ge 0\right\}.\tag{3.4}$$

The reason for the choice of β in (3.2) and of p in (3.3)-(3.4) relies on the following result (cf. also [15, Prop. 8.8] and [18, Lemma 3.2]), which will guarantee well-posedness of the controlled state equation (Proposition 3.4).

Lemma 3.3. *Let* E,V *be real Banach spaces, let* $\beta\in[0,1)$, $p>\frac{1}{1-\beta}$. *Let* $f\in L^p_{loc}([0,+\infty);E)$ *and let* $g:(0,+\infty)\to\mathscr{L}(E,V)$ *be strongly continuous*[4] *and such that* $|g(s)|_{\mathscr{L}(E,V)}\le C_0(s^{-\beta}\vee 1)$ *for some* $C_0>0$ *for every* $s\in(0,+\infty)$. *Then* $F:\mathbb{R}^+\to V$ *defined as Bochner integral by*

$$F(t):=\int_0^t g(t-s)f(s)ds,\ \ t\in\mathbb{R}^+,$$

is well defined and continuous.

Proof. Let $t>0$. First of all, we note that the map

$$[0,t)\to V,\ \ s\mapsto g(t-s)f(s),$$

is measurable for each $t>0$. Indeed, given $t>0$ the above map can be seen as the composition $h_1\circ h_2$ where

$$h_1:(0,t]\times E\to V,\quad h_1(s,e)=g(s)e;\qquad h_2:[0,t)\to(0,t]\times E,\quad h_2(s)=(t-s,f(s)).$$

Now, h_2 is clearly measurable. Also h_1 is measurable, as it is continuous: indeed $g(\cdot)e$ is continuous for each $e\in E$ and $\{g(s)\}_{s\in[\varepsilon,t]}\subseteq\mathscr{L}(E,V)$ is a family of uniformly bounded operators for each $\varepsilon\in(0,t)$. Hence $h_1\circ h_2$ is measurable.

Given the above, it makes sense to consider $\int_0^t g(t-s)f(s)ds$ in Bochner sense for each $t>0$. By Hölder's inequality, setting $\kappa:=-\frac{\beta p}{p-1}+1>0$, we have for each $t>0$

$$\int_0^t|g(t-s)f(s)|_V ds\le\int_0^t(t-s)^{-\beta}|f(s)|_V ds\le\left(\int_0^t(t-s)^{-\beta\frac{p}{p-1}}ds\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}|f|_{L^p([0,T];\mathbb{R})}=\left(\frac{t^\kappa}{\kappa}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}|f|_{L^p([0,T];\mathbb{R})}.$$

This show, at once, that F is well defined as Bochner integral in V and that $\lim_{t\to 0^+}F(t)=0$, so F is continuous at 0.

[4] Meaning that $g(\cdot)e:(0,+\infty)\to V$ is continuous for each $e\in E$.

Let us show now that F is continuous on each interval of the form $[t_0, T]$ with $t_0 \in (0, T)$. Set, for $\varepsilon \in (0, t_0)$,

$$F_\varepsilon(t) := \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} g(t-s) f(s) ds, \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

By dominated convergence we easily see that F_ε is continuous on $[t_0, T]$. Moreover, using again Hölder's inequality we have, for all $t \in [t_0, T]$

$$|F(t) - F_\varepsilon(t)| \leq \left(\int_{t-\varepsilon}^t (t-s)^{-\beta \frac{p}{p-1}} ds \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} |f|_{L^p([0,T];\mathbb{R})} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon^\kappa}{\kappa} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} |f|_{L^p([0,T];\mathbb{R})}.$$

This show $F_\varepsilon \to F$ uniformly in $[t_0, T]$, hence F is continuous in $[t_0, T]$, concluding the proof. □

Proposition 3.4. *For each $u(\cdot) \in \mathscr{U}_p$, the process*

$$X(t; x, u(\cdot)) := e^{tA} x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sigma dW(s) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{(t-s)A} G} L(u(s)) ds, \tag{3.5}$$

is well-defined and belongs to $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,loc}(H)$. Moreover it admits a version with continuous trajectories.

Proof. By Remark 3.2 and Assumption 3.1(iii)-(iv), we can apply Lemma 3.3 with

$$E = L^1(\Omega; K), \quad V = L^1(\Omega; H), \quad f(s) = L(u(s))$$

and $g(s) \in \mathscr{L}(E, V)$ defined by

$$[g(s)Z](\omega) := \overline{e^{sA} G} Z(\omega), \quad Z \in L^1(\Omega; K).$$

It follows that

$$t \mapsto \int_0^t \overline{e^{(t-s)A} G} L(u(s)) ds \tag{3.6}$$

is well defined as stochastic process and belongs to $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,loc}(H)$. We can repeat the argument employed above for this term, dealing now with the trajectories. Fixing $\omega \in \Omega$ and taking now

$$E = K, \quad V = H, \quad f(s) := L(u(s)(\omega)), \quad g(s) = \overline{e^{sA} G},$$

it follows that the map

$$\mathbb{R}^+ \to H, \quad t \mapsto \int_0^t \overline{e^{(t-s)A} G} L(u(s)(\omega)) ds$$

is continuous. The latter integral expression, for varying $\omega \in \Omega$, clearly provides a version of (3.6) with continuous trajectories.

On the other hand, in view of Assumption 3.1(ii), from [8, Th. 5.2 and Th. 5.11] we know that the *stochastic convolution*

$$t \mapsto \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sigma dW(s), \quad t \geq 0,$$

is a (well defined) stochastic process belonging to $\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{P}}^{2,loc}(H)$ and admitting a version with continuous trajectories, concluding the proof. □

We refer to the process (3.5) as the *controlled Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process* or *mild solution* of SDE (3.1). We always consider its continuous trajectories version (unique up to indistinguishability).

Given $\lambda > 0$, $x \in H$, and[5]

$$l : H \times \Lambda \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable and bounded from below,} \tag{3.7}$$

consider the functional

$$J(x; u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} l(X(s; x, u(\cdot)), u(s)) ds\right], \quad x \in H,\ u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_p. \tag{3.8}$$

Clearly, the latter is well defined for each $x \in H$ and $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_p$ (possibly with value $+\infty$) by measurability and boundedness from below of l. The stochastic optimal control problem consists in minimizing the functional above over the set of admissible controls $\mathcal{U}_p$, i.e. in solving the optimization problem

$$V(x) := \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_p} J(x; u(\cdot)), \quad x \in H. \tag{3.9}$$

The function $V : H \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is the so called value function of the optimization problem. If $x \in H$ is such that $V(x) < +\infty$ and $u^*(\cdot)$ is such that $V(x) = J(x; u^*(\cdot))$, then $u^*(\cdot)$ is called *optimal strategy* and the associated state trajectory is called *optimal state*; moreover the couple $(u^*(\cdot), X(\cdot; x, u^*(\cdot)))$ is called *optimal couple*.

Remark 3.5. *Here H is the state space and U the control space. The space K, where the map L takes values, is introduced to give more flexibility to the class of problems we study. In most cases K will be either equal to the state space H, or to the control space U (or, more generally, U will be a subset of K). The choice of K depends on the specific problem at hand. For instance, in the boundary control case of Subsection 6, it is natural to take $K = H$.*

Remark 3.6. *In our formulation of the optimal control problem we consider the filtered probability space and the cylindrical Brownian motion as fixed. This means that we are considering the so-called* strong formulation *for the stochastic optimal control problem. It is possible to consider the problem also in the so-called* weak formulation*, i.e. letting the filtered probability space and the Wiener process vary with the control strategy $u(\cdot)$ (see, e.g., [37, Ch. 2]). More precisely, in the weak formulation, the control strategy will be a* 6*-tuple*

$$\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \{\overline{\mathcal{F}_t}\}_{t \geq 0}, \overline{\mathbb{P}}, \overline{W}, \overline{u}(\cdot)\right),$$

where $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \{\overline{\mathcal{F}_t}\}_{t \geq 0}, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ is a filtered probability space, $\overline{W} = (\overline{W_t})_{t \geq 0}$ is a Ξ-valued cylindrical Brownian motion, and $\overline{u}(\cdot) : \overline{\Omega} \times [0, +\infty) \to \Lambda$ is $\{\overline{\mathcal{F}_t}\}_{t \geq 0}$-progressively measurable with $\int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\overline{u}(s)|_U^p ds < +\infty$ for all $t \geq 0$. Calling $\overline{\mathcal{U}_p}$ the set such control strategies, the objective is to minimize the cost (3.8) over $\overline{\mathcal{U}_p}$. The resulting value function $\overline{V}$ is, in principle, smaller than V. The main advantage in choosing such formulation is that existence of optimal control strategies in feedback form is easier to obtain, see Remark 5.6 and Corollary 5.7.

[5] Cases where l is not bounded from below can be treated adding suitable growth conditions which depends on the specific problem at hand. We do not do it here for brevity. See also Remark 4.17 on this.

4 Generalized Dynkin's formula

4.1 Transition semigroups, generators and G-derivatives

In order to prove an abstract Dynkin formula applicable to the controlled process (3.5), we consider the family of transition semigroups associated to the uncontrolled version of (3.5) and to the same process under constant controls. Precisely, we denote by $X^{(k)}(\cdot;x)$, $k \in K$, the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process starting at $x \in H$ with extra drift Gk; i.e., the mild solution to

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + Gk]dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad t \geq 0, \\ X(0) = x. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

The explicit expression is

$$X^{(k)}(t;x) := e^{tA}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\sigma dW(s) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{(t-s)A}Gk}ds. \tag{4.2}$$

Correspondingly, we define the associated transition semigroups $\{P_t^{(k)}\}_{t\geq 0}$, $k \in K$, in the space $C_b(H)$ as

$$P_t^{(k)}[\varphi](x) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X^{(k)}(t;x))], \quad k \in K. \tag{4.3}$$

The fact that $\{P_t^{(k)}\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a one-parameter semigroup of linear operators in the space $C_b(H)$ is a consequence of the strong Markov property of $X^{(k)}$ (see, e.g., [8, Ch. 9]). Unfortunately, as well known, such semigroup is not in general a C_0-semigroup in $C_b(H)$. Indeed, in the framework of spaces of functions not vanishing at infinity, the C_0-property, i.e. the fact that $\lim_{s\to 0^+} P_s^{(k)}\phi = \phi$ for every ϕ, fails even in basic cases. For instance, this property fails in the case of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup in the space $C_b(\mathbb{R})$ (see, e.g., [2, Example 6.1] for a counterexample in $UC_b(\mathbb{R})$, or [6, Lemma 3.2], which implies this is a C_0-semigroup in $UC_b(\mathbb{R})$ if and only if the drift of the SDE vanishes). Even worse: given $\varphi \in C_b(H)$, the map $[0,+\infty) \to C_b(H)$, $t \mapsto P_t^{(k)}\varphi$ is not in general measurable, as shown in [12, Example 4.5]. This prevents, for instance, to intend in Bochner sense, in the space $C_b(H)$ for each $g \in C_b(H)$, the integral defining the Laplace transform

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} P_s^{(k)}[g]ds. \tag{4.4}$$

Nevertheless, one can give a pointwise sense, for each $x \in H$, to many statements of the classical theory of C_0-semigroups. This is the approach of the theory of π-semigroups (see [32, 33]) that we apply here.

Remark 4.1. *The theory of weakly continuous semigroups [2] (also called $\mathcal{K}$-semigroups [4]) is also employable here. In our context the approach through π-semigroups seems more natural with respect to the former one, as the definition of generator given in the context of π-semigroups is more suitable to prove our key result Proposition 4.12.*

Also the more recent theory of C_0-sequentially equicontinuous semigroups in locally convex spaces [13] can be employed, but it goes beyond the needs of this paper, which only deals with the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Such theory might be useful in extending the results of this paper to more general types of controlled processes.

The definition of π-convergence can be found e.g. in [10, p. 111], where it is called *bp*-convergence (bounded-pointwise convergence) and in [32, 33]; the former in the space $C_b(H)$, the latter in the space $UC_b(H)$.

Definition 4.2 (π-convergence)**.** *A sequence of functions $(f_n) \subseteq C_b(H)$ is said to be π-convergent to a function $f \in C_b(H)$ if*

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |f_n|_{C_b(H)} < +\infty \ \text{ and } \ \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = f(x), \quad \forall x \in H.$$

Such convergence is denoted by $f_n \xrightarrow{\pi} f$ or by $f = \pi\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n$.

Now we recall the definition of π-semigroup as given in [32, 33]. Here we state it in the space of continuous and bounded functions (the aforementioned references deal with the space of *uniformly* continuous and bounded functions).

Definition 4.3. *A semigroup $\{P_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ of bounded linear operators on $C_b(H)$ is called a π-semigroup on $C_b(H)$ if it satisfies the following conditions.*

(P1) There exist $M \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|P_t f|_\infty \leq M e^{\alpha t} |f|_\infty$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $f \in C_b(H)$.

(P2) For each $x \in H$ and $f \in C_b(H)$, the map $\mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto P_t f(x)$ is continuous.

(P3) We have

$$\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C_b(H), \ \ f_n \xrightarrow{\pi} f \in C_b(H) \implies P_t[f_n] \xrightarrow{\pi} P_t[f] \ \ \forall t \geq 0.$$

Define

$$\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(k)}) := \left\{ \varphi \in C_b(H) : \ \exists\, \pi\text{-}\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{P_t^{(k)}[\varphi] - \varphi}{t} \right\} \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\mathscr{A}^{(k)}[\varphi] := \pi\text{-}\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{P_t^{(k)}[\varphi] - \varphi}{t}, \qquad \varphi \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(k)}). \tag{4.6}$$

Remark 4.4. *It can be proved that, on a space $\mathscr{S}$ of sufficiently smooth functions, the operator $\mathscr{A}^{(k)}$ acts as a differential operator. For instance, when $k = 0$, it is proved in [33, Th. 7.4.7] or in [34, Th. 4.3] (see also [4, Th. 5.8]) that*

$$\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi](x) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sigma\sigma^* D^2\varphi(x)\right] + \left\langle x, A^* D\varphi(x)\right\rangle, \qquad \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{S}. \tag{4.7}$$

However, we do not need this characterization, as we will always treat $\mathscr{A}^{(k)}$ as an abstract object. We will only use (4.7) *to formally motivate the definition of mild solution of the HJB equation associated to the control problem of Section 3 (Definition 5.1).*

Proposition 4.5.

(i) We have[6]

$$\frac{d}{dt}P_t^{(k)}[\varphi](x) = P_t^{(k)}[\mathscr{A}^{(k)}[\varphi]](x) = \mathscr{A}^{(k)}[P_t^{(k)}[\varphi]](x), \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(k)}), \ \forall x \in H, \ \forall t \geq 0.$$

(ii) The linear operator $R_\lambda^{(k)} : C_b(H) \to C_b(H)$ defined by

$$R_\lambda^{(k)}[g](x) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} P_s^{(k)}[g](x)\, ds, \quad g \in C_b(H), \ x \in H,$$

belongs to $\mathscr{L}(C_b(H))$ for every $\lambda > 0$ and is the resolvent of $\mathscr{A}^{(k)}$:

$$(\lambda - \mathscr{A}^{(k)})^{-1} = R_\lambda^{(k)}, \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

[6] At $t = 0$ the derivative is intended as right derivative.

Proof. Both the claims follow from [32, Prop. 3.2, Prop. 3.6] or [33, Prop. 6.2.7, Prop. 6.2.11] once one proves that $\{P_t^{(k)}\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a π-semigroup in the space $C_b(H)$([7]). (P1) of Definition 4.3 is verified with $M=1$ and $\alpha=0$. (P3) of Definition 4.3 is verified by dominated convergence. (P2) of Definition 4.3 corresponds to

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X^{(k)}(t;x)] \overset{t\to t_0}{\longrightarrow} \mathbb{E}[f(X^{(k)}(t_0;x)], \quad \forall f\in C_b(H),\ \forall x\in H,\ \forall t_0\geq 0. \tag{4.8}$$

By continuity of trajectories of the process $X^{(k)}(\cdot;x)$ and dominated convergence, the latter is true. □

Remark 4.6. *Concerning the results of Proposition 4.5, we observe that also the theory of C_0-sequentially equicontinuous semigroups [13] could be applied.*

Recall that, given $G\in\mathscr{L}_u(K,H)$, the pseudo-inverse $G^{-1}:\mathscr{R}(G)\to\mathscr{D}(G)$ is defined as the operator that associates to each $h\in\mathscr{R}(G)$ the element of $G^{-1}(\{h\})$ having minimum norm.[8] Note that $G^{-1}G:\mathscr{D}(G)\to\mathscr{D}(G)$ is bounded, so it can be extended to a bounded operator $\overline{G^{-1}G}\in\mathscr{L}(K)$.

Lemma 4.7. *We have*

$$\left\langle D^G f(x), \overline{G^{-1}G}k\right\rangle = \left\langle D^G f(x), k\right\rangle, \quad \forall k\in K,\ \forall x\in H. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. Assume first that $k\in\mathscr{D}(G)$. In this case $GG^{-1}Gk=Gk$. Then, using Remark 2.4, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle D^G f(x), \overline{G^{-1}G}k\right\rangle &= \lim_{s\to 0}\frac{f(x+s\overline{GG^{-1}G}k)-f(x)}{s}\\ &= \lim_{s\to 0}\frac{f(x+sGk)-f(x)}{s}\\ &= \left\langle D^G f(x), k\right\rangle, \quad \forall x\in H.\end{aligned}$$

If $k\notin\mathscr{D}(G)$, we can take a sequence $\{k_n\}\subseteq\mathscr{D}(G)$ converging to k. Considering (4.9) on k_n and passing to the limit the claim follows taking into account that $\overline{G^{-1}G}$ is bounded. □

Assumption 4.8. *The operator $G\in\mathscr{L}_u(K,H)$ is such that for every $k\in K$*

(i) there exists $\varepsilon>0$ such that $\left\{\int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right\}_{t\in(0,\varepsilon)}\subseteq\mathscr{R}(G)$;

(ii) $G^{-1}\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\to\overline{G^{-1}G}k$, as $t\to 0^+$.

Remark 4.9. *Note that $\int_0^t e^{sA}h\,ds\in\mathscr{D}(A)$ for every $t>0$ and $h\in H$. So, in view of the fact that $\overline{G^{-1}G}$ is bounded, Assumption 4.8 is verified, in particular, if $K=H$, $\mathscr{D}(A)\subseteq\mathscr{D}(G)$ and, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$,*

$$G\int_0^t e^{sA}h\,ds=\int_0^t\overline{e^{sA}G}h\,ds, \quad \forall t\in(0,\varepsilon),\ \forall h\in H.$$

This applies, e.g., to the case when A is self-adjoint nonnegative and $G=(A+\delta I)^\beta$, with $\delta\geq 0$, $\beta\in[0,1]$ (see Section 6).

[7] These references deal mainly in the space of uniformly continuous and bounded functions — we warn that the author denotes by $C_b(H)$ the latter space. The extension to the space of continuous and bounded function — our space $C_b(H)$ — is illustrated in [32, Sec. 5] and [33, Sec. 6.5].

[8] Existence and uniqueness of such an element follows from the fact that G is a closed operator and applying the results of [9, Sec. II.4.29, p. 74]).

Remark 4.10. *Assumption 4.8 might be considered restrictive. Indeed, to be verified, it requires a kind of commutativity between the semigroup e^{tA} and the operator G, as in the specific example outlined in Remark 4.9 and extensively described in Section 6.*

However, we must observe that Assumption 4.8 is only needed to show that the statement of Lemma 4.11 holds for a class of functions which includes the mild solution of the HJB equation associated to our initial control problem. This could also be done in different contexts, where the actual Assumption 4.8 does not hold. In particular, we mention the stochastic control problem with delayed control studied in [21]. For such problem Assumption 4.8 does not hold (taking as G the bounded operator B described in [21, Subsection 3.2]). However, it can be proved, using the arguments of [21, Subsection 4.2], that the statement of Lemma 4.11 holds in this case for the class of functions $\Sigma^1_{T,\alpha}$ defined in [21, Def. 5.1], to which the mild solution v of the associated HJB equation belongs.

Lemma 4.11. *Let Assumption 4.8 hold true and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be the constant involved in such assumption. Let $f \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ and let $x : [0,\varepsilon] \to H$, $t \mapsto x(t)$ be continuous. Then*

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{f\left(x(t) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right) - f(x(t))}{t} = \left\langle D^G f(x(0)), k\right\rangle_K, \quad \forall k \in K.$$

Proof. Let $k \in K$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be as in Assumption 4.8(i). Let $G^{-1} : \mathscr{R}(G) \subseteq H \to \mathscr{D}(G)$ be the pseudo-inverse of G. Noting that $GG^{-1}h = h$ for every $h \in \mathscr{R}(G)$, by Assumption 4.8(i) we can write

$$\int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds = Gk(t), \text{ where } k(t) := G^{-1}\int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds, \quad \forall t \in (0,\varepsilon). \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, by Assumption 4.8(ii), we have

$$\frac{k(t)}{t} \overset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow} \overline{G^{-1}G}k. \tag{4.11}$$

Fix now $t \in (0,\varepsilon)$. Using (4.10) we write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f\left(x(t) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right) - f(x(t))}{t} =& \frac{f(x(t)+Gk(t)) - f(x(t)) - \left\langle D^G f(x(t)), k(t)\right\rangle_K}{t} \\ &+ \left\langle D^G f(x(t)), \frac{k(t)}{t}\right\rangle_K.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Mean value theorem applied to the function $[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \mapsto f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))$ yields (see also Remark 2.4)

$$\begin{aligned} f(x(t)+Gk(t)) - f(x(t)) &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{d\xi} f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))\,d\xi \\ &= \int_0^1 \lim_{\eta\to 0} \frac{f(x(t)+(\xi+\eta)Gk(t) - f(x(t)+G\xi k(t))}{\eta}\,d\xi \\ &= \int_0^1 \left\langle D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t)), k(t)\right\rangle_K d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (4.12) rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f\left(x(t) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right) - f(x(t))}{t} =& \frac{\int_0^1 \left\langle D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t)) - D^G f(x(t), k(t)\right\rangle_K d\xi}{t} \\ &+ \left\langle D^G f(x(t)), \frac{k(t)}{t}\right\rangle_K.\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Now

$$\frac{\left|\left\langle D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))-D^G f(x(t)),k(t)\right\rangle_K\right|}{t}\leq\left|D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))-D^G f(x(t))\right|\left|\frac{k(t)}{t}\right|,\ \forall\xi\in[0,1]. \tag{4.14}$$

Now we are going to take the limit for $t\to 0^+$. To this purpose, we observe that, as $D^G f$ is continuous and $\{x(t)\}_{t\in(0,\varepsilon)}$ is compact in H, we have

$$\sup_{t\in(0,\varepsilon)}|D^G f(x(t)+h)-D^G f(x(t))|\overset{|h|\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow}0. \tag{4.15}$$

By (4.15), and taking into account that, by definition (4.10), $|Gk(t)|\to 0$ as $t\to 0^+$, we get

$$\sup_{\xi\in[0,1]}\left|D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))-D^G f(x(t))\right|\overset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow}0. \tag{4.16}$$

Hence, combining (4.11), (4.14) and (4.16), we get that

$$\frac{\int_0^1\left\langle D^G f(x(t)+\xi Gk(t))-D^G f(x(t)),k(t)\right\rangle_K d\xi}{t}\overset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow}0. \tag{4.17}$$

Moreover, (4.11) and the continuity of the maps $t\mapsto x(t)$ and $x\mapsto D^G f(x)$ entail

$$\left\langle D^G f(x(t)),\frac{k(t)}{t}\right\rangle_K\overset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow}\left\langle D^G f(x(0)),\overline{G^{-1}Gk}\right\rangle_K. \tag{4.18}$$

Now, combining (4.13), (4.17), (4.18), and Lemma 4.7 the claim follows. □

Proposition 4.12. *Let Assumption 4.8 hold true and let $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})\cap C_b^{1,G}(H)$. Then $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(k)})$ for every $k\in K$ and*

$$\mathscr{A}^{(k)}[\varphi]=\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi]+\langle D^G\varphi(\cdot),k\rangle_K. \tag{4.19}$$

Proof. Let $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})\cap C_b^{1,G}(H)$ and $x\in H$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{A}^{(k)}[\varphi](x)=\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{P_t^{(k)}[\varphi](x)-\varphi(x)}{t}&=\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{P_t^{(k)}[\varphi](x)-P_t^{(0)}[\varphi](x)}{t}+\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{P_t^{(0)}[\varphi](x)-\varphi(x)}{t}\\&=\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(X^{(k)}(t;x))-\varphi(X^{(0)}(t,x))\right]}{t}+\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi](x),\end{aligned}$$

if the last limit exists. Observing that

$$X^{(k)}(t;x)=X^{(0)}(t;x)+\int_0^t\overline{e^{(t-s)A}G}k\,ds=X^{(0)}(t;x)+\int_0^t\overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds,$$

by using Lemma 4.11, continuity of $t\mapsto\int_0^t\overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds$ and dominated convergence, we get

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(X^{(k)}(t;x))-\varphi(X^{(0)}(t;x))\right]}{t}=\lim_{t\to 0^+}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\varphi\left(X^{(0)}(t;x)+\int_0^t\overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right)-\varphi(X^{(0)}(t;x))}{t}\right]$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\varphi\left(X^{(0)}(t;x)+\int_0^t\overline{e^{sA}G}k\,ds\right)-\varphi(X^{(0)}(t;x))}{t}\right]=\langle D^G\varphi(x),k\rangle_K.$$

The claim follows. □

4.2 Proof of the generalized Dynkin's formula

We introduce the linear space $\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ of K-valued p-integrable càdlàg simple processes. An element $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ is of the form

$$\kappa(t)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}k_{i-1}\mathbf{1}_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(t), \tag{4.20}$$

for some $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $0=t_0<t_1<\ldots<t_n=+\infty$, and $\{k_i\}_{i=0,\ldots,n-1}$ such that $k_i\in L^p(\Omega,\mathscr{F}_{t_i},\mathbb{P};K)$ for all $i=0,\ldots,n-1$. Processes in $\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ are progressively measurable. By arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.4 we get that, for any $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$, the process

$$t\mapsto\int_0^t\overline{e^{(t-s)A}G}\kappa(s)ds$$

is well defined, belongs to $\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,loc}(H)$ and has a version with continuous trajectories. We will always refer to the version of this process (unique up to indistinguishability) having continuous trajectories. Given $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$, we write

$$X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t,x):=e^{tA}x+\int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\sigma dW(s)+\int_0^t\overline{e^{(t-s)A}G}\kappa(s)ds.$$

Again arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.4 we see that this process has a version with having continuous trajectories. As above we will always refer to this version (unique up to indistinguishability).

Recall that, if V_1, V_2 are two random variables with values, respectively, in two measurable spaces $(E_1,\mathscr{E}_1)$ and $(E_2,\mathscr{E}_2)$, a version of the conditional law of V_1 given V_2 is a family of probability measures $\{\mu(\cdot,v_2)\}_{v_2\in E_2}$ on $(E_1,\mathscr{E}_1)$ such that, for every $f\in B_b(E_1\times E_2;\mathbb{R})$, the map $v_2\mapsto\int_{E_1}f(v_1,v_2)\mu(dv_1,v_2)$ is measurable and

$$\mathbb{E}[f(V_1,V_2)]=\int_{E_2}\nu(dv_2)\int_E f(v_1,v_2)\mu(dv_1,v_2),$$

where $\nu=Law(V_2)$. This family, if it exists, is unique up to ν-null measure sets.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ be in the form (4.20) and $t\in[t_{i-1},t_i)$ for some $i=1,\ldots,n$. A version of the conditional law of $X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)$ given the couple $(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})$ is the family*

$$\mu_t(\cdot,x',k'):=Law\,(X^{(k')}(t-t_{i-1};x')). \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. By the semigroup property

$$X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t,x)=e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x)+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}\sigma dW(s)+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t\overline{e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}G}k_{i-1}ds\quad\forall t\in[t_{i-1},t_i).$$

Let $\mathscr{G}$ be the σ-algebra generated by the couple $\left(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1}\right)$ and note that the first and the third term in the sum above are $\mathscr{G}$-measurable, whereas the second one is independent of $\mathscr{G}$. Hence, given $f:H\times(H\times K)\to\mathbb{R}$ and letting ν be the law of the couple $(X^{k(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x),(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})\right)\right]\\
&=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x),(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})\right)\,|\,\mathscr{G}\right]\right]\\
&=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x)+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}\sigma dW(s)+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t\overline{e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}G}k_{i-1}ds,(X^{k(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})\right)\,|\,\mathscr{G}\right]\right]\\
&=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}x'+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}\sigma dW(s)+\int_{t_{i-1}}^t\overline{e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}G}k'ds,(x',k')\right)\right]\Big|_{x'=X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k'=k_{i-1}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last equality, we have used [8, Prop. 1.12]. Since

$$e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}x' + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t} e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}\sigma dW(s) + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t} \overline{e^{(t-t_{i-1})A}G}k'ds = X^{(k')}(t-t_{i-1};x')$$

we have, by (4.21) and the equality just above,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x),(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})\right)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_H f\left(\xi,(x',k')\right)\mu_t(d\xi;x',k')\Big|_{x'=X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k'=k_{i-1}}\right]\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\int_H f\left(\xi,(x',k')\right)\mu_t(d\xi;x',k'),\end{aligned}$$

where ν is the joint law of $\left(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1}\right)$. This is the claim. □

Lemma 4.14. *Let Assumption 4.8 hold. Let $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})\cap C_b^{1,G}(H)$ and let $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$. Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi]\big(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\big) + \left\langle k(t), D^G\varphi(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\right\rangle_K\right],\quad \forall t\geq 0, \tag{4.22}$$

where the derivative has to be intended as right derivative at the times $\{t_1,...,t_n\}$, where the simple process $\kappa(\cdot)$ jumps.

Proof. Let $\kappa(\cdot)\in\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ be in the form (4.20), $t\in[t_{i-1},t_i)$ for some $i=1,...,n$, $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})\cap C_b^{1,G}(H)$, and denote by ν the law of the couple $(X^{k(\cdot)}(t_{i-1};x),k_{i-1})$. By Lemma 4.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{k(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right] &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\int_H\varphi(\xi)\mu_t(d\xi;x',k')\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\,\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{(k')}(t-t_{i-1};x')\big)\right]\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')P^{(k')}_{t-t_{i-1}}[\varphi](x')\end{aligned}$$

Now we differentiate under the integral sign[9] using the fact that, by Proposition 4.12, $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(k')})$ and that $P^{(k')}_t[\mathscr{A}^{(k')}[\varphi]]$ is bounded. Then, using Proposition 4.5(i) and (4.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right] &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\frac{d}{dt}P^{(k')}_{t-t_{i-1}}[\varphi](x')\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')P^{(k')}_{t-t_{i-1}}[\mathscr{A}^{(k')}[\varphi]](x')\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\,\mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{A}^{(k')}[\varphi](X^{(k')}(t-t_{i-1});x)\right]\\ &= \int_{H\times K}\nu(dx',dk')\int_H\mathscr{A}^{(k')}[\varphi](\xi)\mu_t(d\xi;x',k')\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{A}^{(k_{i-1})}[\varphi]\big(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi]\big(X^{\kappa(\cdot)}(t;x)\big) + \left\langle k(t), D^G\varphi(X^{k(\cdot)}(t;x))\right\rangle_K\right],\end{aligned}$$

the claim. □

Lemma 4.15. *For each $u(\cdot)\in\mathscr{U}_p$ and $T>0$, there exists a sequence $\{\kappa_n(\cdot)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ such that*

$$\kappa_n(\cdot)|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}\overset{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(H)}{\longrightarrow}L(u(\cdot))|_{[0,T]\times\Omega},\quad X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(\cdot;x)|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}\overset{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,T}(H)}{\longrightarrow}X(\cdot;x,u(\cdot))|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}.$$

[9] The derivative is intended as right-derivative at $t=t_{i-1}$.

Proof. Fix $T>0$ and set $\kappa(\cdot):=L(u(\cdot))$. By standard arguments (see, e.g., [25, Ch. III, Lemma. 2.4, p.132])[10], we can construct a sequence $\{\kappa_n(\cdot)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subset\mathscr{K}^{s,p}$ such that

$$\kappa_n(\cdot)|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}\overset{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{p,T}(H)}{\longrightarrow}\kappa(\cdot)|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}.$$

Then, using the expression (3.5) for the state variable, the convergence

$$X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(\cdot;x)|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}\overset{\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,T}(H)}{\longrightarrow}X(\cdot;x,u(\cdot))|_{[0,T]\times\Omega}$$

follows by simply applying dominated convergence. □

Theorem 4.16 (Dynkin's formula)**.** *Let Assumption 4.8 hold. Let $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})\cap C_b^{1,G}(H)$. Then, for every $\lambda>0$, $T>0$, and $u(\cdot)\in\mathscr{U}_p$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda T}\varphi\big(X(T;x,u(\cdot))\big)\right]\\&=\varphi(x)+\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t}\left[(\mathscr{A}^{(0)}-\lambda)[\varphi]\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)+\Big\langle L(u(t)),D^G\varphi(X(t;x,u(\cdot)))\Big\rangle_K\right]dt\right].\end{aligned}\tag{4.23}$$

Proof. Let $u(\cdot)\in\mathscr{U}_p$ and take the approximating sequence $\kappa_n(\cdot)$ provided by Lemma 4.15. Then, applying, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, Lemma 4.14, we obtain from (4.22) (by taking the right derivatives at t_i), for all $t\geq 0$ and $\lambda>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right]\\&=-\lambda e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\big(X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right]+e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi]\big(X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)+\Big\langle\kappa_n(t),D^G\varphi\big(X^{k_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\Big\rangle_K\right].\end{aligned}\tag{4.24}$$

Since the function $t\mapsto\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda t}\varphi\big(X^{k_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)\right]$ is everywhere continuous and stepwise differentiable, we can apply the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus. So, integrating on $[0,T]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda T}\varphi\big(X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(T;x)\big)\right]\\&=\varphi(x)+\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t}\left((\mathscr{A}^{(0)}-\lambda)[\varphi]\big(X^{k_n(\cdot)}(t;x)\big)+\Big\langle\kappa_n(t),D^G\varphi(X^{\kappa_n(\cdot)}(t;x))\Big\rangle_K\right)dt\right].\end{aligned}$$

Now, letting $n\to+\infty$, we get the claim by dominated convergence from Lemma 4.15, observing that $\varphi, D^G\varphi, \mathscr{A}^{(0)}[\varphi]$ are bounded. □

Remark 4.17. *The results of this section, in particular Theorem 4.16, can be extended, at the price of straightforward technical complications, to the case when the basic space of functions is, instead of $C_b(H)$, the space $C_m(H)$, where $m>0$, used e.g. in [12]:*

$$C_m(H):=\left\{\phi:H\to\mathbb{R}\ \textit{continuous}:\ \sup_{x\in H}\frac{|\phi(x)|}{1+|x|^m}<+\infty\right\}.\tag{4.25}$$

This is a Banach space with the norm $\|\phi\|_{C_m(H)}:=\sup_{x\in H}\frac{|\phi(x)|}{1+|x|^m}$. Also the results of next Section 5 can be extended to this setting covering more general cases, in particular when the current cost of the control problem has polynomial growth in x. We do not do this here for brevity.

[10] It is worth to point out some differences. First, we are dealing with cádlág approximations (as it is more meaningful and natural to state Proposition 4.14) rather than with càglàd (as in [25, Ch. III, Lemma. 2.4, p.132]): this is not a problem as, from the point of view of integration, these classes coincide. Second, we are dealing with Hilbert-valued processes: therefore, more technical care is needed as the approximation is produced by Bochner integration.

5 HJB equation, verification theorem and optimal feedbacks

By standard Dynamic Programming arguments, one formally associates to the control problem of Section 3 the following HJB equation for the value function (3.9):

$$\lambda v(x) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}[QD^2v(x)] + \langle Ax, Dv(x)\rangle + F(x, Dv(x)) = 0, \quad x \in H, \tag{5.1}$$

where $Q = \sigma\sigma^*$ and the Hamiltonian F is defined by

$$F(x,p) := \inf_{u\in\Lambda} F_{CV}(x,p;u), \quad x \in H,\ p \in H, \tag{5.2}$$

where

$$F_{CV}(x,p;u) := \inf_{u\in\Lambda}\left\{\langle GL(u), p\rangle_H + l(x,u)\right\}, \quad x \in H,\ u \in \Lambda,\ p \in H. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that this definition is only formal as $GL(u)$ may not be defined, since $L(u)$ may not belong to $\mathscr{D}(G)$. It is then convenient here to introduce the modified Hamiltonian F_0 as follows

$$F_0(x,q) := \inf_{u\in\Lambda} F_{0,CV}(x,q;u), \quad x \in H,\ q \in K, \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$F_{0,CV}(x,q;u) := \langle L(u), q\rangle_K + l(x,u), \quad x \in H,\ u \in \Lambda,\ q \in K. \tag{5.5}$$

Observing that

$$F(x,p) = F_0(x, G^*p), \quad \forall p \in \mathscr{D}(G^*),$$

(5.1) can be formally rewritten as

$$\lambda v(x) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}[QD^2v(x)] + \langle Ax, Dv(x)\rangle + F_0(x, D^G v(x)) = 0, \quad x \in H. \tag{5.6}$$

Note that, in principle, F_0 may take the value $-\infty$ somewhere. The concept of mild solution to (5.1) relies on Proposition 4.5(ii) and on (4.7), which inspire an integral form of (5.6) through the use of the semigroup $(P_s^{(0)})_{s\geq 0}$ (see [12] on existence and uniqueness of mild solutions).

Definition 5.1. *We say that a function v is a mild solution to* (5.6) *if it belongs to $C_b^{1,G}(H)$, $F_0(\cdot, D^G v(\cdot))$ is (finite and) bounded on H, and v solves the integral equation*

$$v(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} P_s^{(0)}\left[F_0(\cdot, D^G v(\cdot))\right](x)\,ds, \quad \forall x \in H. \tag{5.7}$$

Remark 5.2. *The problem of existence and uniqueness of mild solutions is addressed in [12]. In particular, existence and uniqueness of mild solutions is stated (see [12, Cor. 4.12, Th. 3.8(ii)] with $m = 0$), for sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$, under the following assumptions:*

(A1) $\overline{e^{tA}G}(K) \subseteq Q_t^{1/2}(H)$ *for every $t > 0$, where $Q_t := \int_0^t e^{sA}\sigma\sigma^* e^{sA^*}\,ds$.*

(A2) The operators[11]

$$\Gamma_G(t) : K \to H, \quad \Gamma_G(t) := Q_t^{-1/2}\overline{e^{tA}G}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

which are well defined by (A1) and bounded by the closed graph theorem, are such that the map $t \mapsto |\Gamma_G(t)|_{\mathscr{L}(K,H)}$ belongs to $L^1_{loc}([0,+\infty),\mathbb{R})$ and is bounded in a neighborhood of $+\infty$ ([12]*).*

[11] Here $Q_t^{-1/2}$ is the pseudo-inverse of $Q_t^{1/2}$.

[12] Note that, under (A1)-(A2), we have $C_b^{1,G}(H) \supseteq \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})$. This can be proved observing that, for each $\phi \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $\psi \in C_b(H)$ such that $\phi = R_\lambda^{(0)}[\psi]$ and applying D^G on both sides of such equation.

(A3) The Hamiltonian F_0 satisfies, for suitable $C_{F_0} > 0$.

$$|F_0(x,q_1) - F_0(x,q_2)| \le C_{F_0}|q_1 - q_2|_K, \qquad \forall x \in H,\ \forall q_1, q_2 \in K,$$

$$|F_0(x,q)| \le C_{F_0}(1 + |q|_K), \qquad \forall x \in H,\ \forall q \in K.$$

Some results in the case of locally Lipschitz Hamiltonian are available, up to now, only in special cases (see [8, Sec. 13.3.1] and [3]).

Due to Proposition 4.5(ii), a mild solution v of (5.1) enjoys the property of being a solution to the same equation also in a differential abstract way, i.e., we have the following.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $v \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ be a mild solution to (5.6). Then $v \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})$ and*

$$(\lambda - \mathscr{A}^{(0)})[v](x) = F_0(x, D^G v(x)), \quad \forall x \in H. \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. Using Proposition 4.5(ii) we rewrite (5.7) as

$$v(x) = \left(\lambda - \mathscr{A}^{(0)}\right)^{-1}\left[F_0(\cdot, D^G v(\cdot))\right](x) ds, \quad \forall x \in H. \tag{5.9}$$

This entails $v \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^{(0)})$ and, applying $\lambda - \mathscr{A}^{(0)}$ to both sides, that v solves (5.8). □

5.1 Verification theorem

The proof of the verification theorem relies in the so called *fundamental identity*.

Proposition 5.4 (Fundamental identity)**.** *Let (3.7) and Assumption 4.8 hold. Let $v \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ be a mild solution to (5.6). Let $x \in H$ and let $u(\cdot) \in \mathscr{U}_p$ be such that*

$$J(x;u(\cdot)) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda t} l(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), u(t)) dt < +\infty. \tag{5.10}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= J(x;u(\cdot)) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda t}\Big(F_0\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\big) - F_{0,CV}\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big); u(t)\big)\Big) dt\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. Let $x \in H$ and let $u(\cdot) \in \mathscr{U}_p$ be such that (5.10) holds. Applying the abstract Dynkin formula (Theorem 4.16) to $t \mapsto e^{-\lambda t} v(X(t;x,u(\cdot)))$ and using Proposition 5.3, we get, for every $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda T} v\big(X(T;x,u(\cdot))\big)\right] \\ &= v(x) + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t}\left[(\mathscr{A}^{(0)} - \lambda)[v]\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big) + \Big\langle L(u(t)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big\rangle_K\right] dt\right], \\ &= v(x) + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t}\left[-F_0\Big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big) + \Big\langle L(u(t)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big\rangle_K\right] dt\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Since l is measurable and bounded from below (see (3.7)), the integral $\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), u(t)) dt$ is well defined (possibly equal to $+\infty$). However, (5.10) actually entails

$$\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), u(t)\big) dt < +\infty \quad \forall T > 0.$$

Then, we can add and subtract $\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)),u(t)\big)dt$ in (5.12) and use (5.5) to get, for $T>0$, rearranging the terms,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{-\lambda T} v\big(X(T;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big] - v(x) + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)),u(t)\big)dt\right] \tag{5.13}$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t}\Big[-F_0\Big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big) + F_{0,CV}\Big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big);u(t)\Big)\Big]\,dt\right].$$

Now we let $T\to+\infty$. The right hand side has a limit (possibly $+\infty$), as the integrand is positive. The left hand side clearly converges to $J(x;u(\cdot))-v(x)$. This implies that also the limit of the right hand side is finite and

$$J(x;u(\cdot)) - v(x)$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda t}\Big[-F_0\Big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big)\Big) + F_{0,CV}\Big(X(t;x,u(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u(\cdot))\big);u(t)\Big)\Big]\,dt\right].$$

The claim follows rearranging the terms. □

Theorem 5.5 (Verification theorem)**.** *Let (3.7) and Assumption 4.8 hold. Let $v\in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ be a mild solution to (5.6). We have the following.*

(i) $v\le V$ *over* H.

(ii) Let $x\in H$ and assume that there exists $u^*(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_p$ such that $\mathbb{P}\times dt-a.e.$

$$F_0\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot))\big)\big) = F_{0,CV}\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot))\big);u^*(t)\big), \tag{5.14}$$

then $v(x)=V(x)=J(x;u^*(\cdot))$.

Proof. (i) By (5.11), for all $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_p$ such that (5.10) holds, we have $v(x)\le J(x;u(\cdot))$, which yields this claim.

(ii) Let $u^*(\cdot)$ such that (5.14) holds. If $J(x;u^*(\cdot))<+\infty$, then, from (5.11), we immediately get $v(x)=J(x;u^*(\cdot))$, which, combined with item (i), yields the claim. We now prove that it cannot be $J(x;u^*(\cdot))=+\infty$. Assume, by contradiction, that $J(x;u^*(\cdot))=+\infty$. Then, by (5.14), we have $\mathbb{P}\times dt-$a.e.

$$l\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)),u^*(t)\big) = F_0\Big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot))\big)\Big) - \Big\langle L(u(t)), D^G v\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot))\big)\Big\rangle_K. \tag{5.15}$$

By (5.8), $F_0(\cdot,D^G v(\cdot))$ is bounded. Hence, Assumption 3.1-(iv), the fact that $u^*(\cdot)\in\mathcal{U}_p$ and (5.15) imply $\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)),u^*(t)\big)dt<+\infty$ for all $T>0$. Then, we can argue as in the proof of Proposition 5.4 getting (5.13) with $u^*(\cdot)$ in this case and, using again (5.14),

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[e^{-\lambda T} v\big(X(T;x,u^*(\cdot))\big)\Big] - v(x) + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} l\big(X(t;x,u^*(\cdot)),u^*(t)\big)dt\right] = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Letting $T\to+\infty$ we get $v(x)=J(x;u^*(\cdot))=+\infty$, a contradiction. □

Remark 5.6. *One can show that the verification theorem above also holds when we consider the control problem in its weak formulation (see Remark 3.6). Indeed, the proof of Theorem 5.5 works for every filtered probability space and any cylindrical Brownian motion on it. Hence, letting the filtered probability space and the cylindrical Brownian motion vary, one gets that $v\le\overline{V}$ over H. Moreover, if (5.14) holds for a given control strategy ([13]) $\overline{u^*}(\cdot)\in\overline{\mathcal{U}_p}$, as defined in Remark 3.6, then we have $v(x)=\overline{V}(x)=J(x;\overline{u^*}(\cdot))$.*

[13] Elements of $\overline{\mathcal{U}_p}$ are 6-tuples as explained in Remark 3.6; however, for simplicity, we denote them simply by $\overline{u(\cdot)}$.

5.2 Optimal feedback controls

As usual, the verification theorem is composed of two statements: the first one states that the solution to the HJB equation enjoys the property of being smaller than the value function; the second one is the most important from the point of view of the control problem, as it furnishes a sufficient condition of optimality ((5.14) in our case). Then, the problem becomes the so-called synthesis of an optimal control, i.e. to produce a control $u^*(\cdot)$ verifying such condition. The answer relies in the study of the *closed loop equation*.

Let $v \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ be a mild solution to HJB equation (5.6). Assuming that the infimum of the map

$$\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}, \quad u \mapsto F_{0,CV}(x, D^G v(x); u)$$

is attained and defining the multivalued function (*feedback map*)

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \colon H &\longrightarrow \mathscr{P}(\Lambda), \\ x &\longmapsto \arg\min_{u\in\Lambda} F_{0,CV}(x, D^G v(x); u), \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

the Closed Loop Equation (CLE) associated with our problem and to v is indeed a stochastic differential inclusion:

$$dX(s) \in AX(s)ds + GL(\Phi(X(s)))ds + \sigma dW(s). \tag{5.18}$$

We have the following result.

Corollary 5.7. *Let Assumption 4.8 hold. Let also (3.7) hold. Let $v \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$ be a mild solution to* (5.6) *and let $x \in H$. Assume that the feedback map Φ defined in (5.17) admits a measurable selection $\phi : H \to U$ and consider the SDE*

$$\begin{cases} dX(s) = \left[AX(s) + GL(\phi(X(s)))\right] ds + \sigma dW(s) \\ X(0) = x, \end{cases} \tag{5.19}$$

(i) Assume that (5.19) *has a mild solution in $\mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,loc}(U)$, i.e. there exists $X_\phi(s;x) \in \mathscr{M}_{\mathscr{P}}^{1,loc}(U)$ such that*

$$X_\phi(t;x) := e^{tA}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\sigma dW(s) + \int_0^t \overline{e^{(t-s)A}} GL(\phi(X_\phi(s;x)))ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Define, for $s \geq 0$, $u_\phi(s) := \phi(X_\phi(s;x))$ and assume that $u_\phi(\cdot) \in \mathscr{U}_p$. Then $v(x) = V(x) = J(x; u_\phi(\cdot))$. In particular the couple $(u_\phi(\cdot), X_\phi(\cdot;x))$ is optimal at x.

Moreover, if $\Phi(x)$ is single-valued and the mild solution to (5.19) *is unique, then the optimal control is unique.*

(ii) Assume that (5.19) has a martingale solution[14] *(see [8, p. 220] or [18, Def. 3.1, p. 75] for the definition) $\overline{X_\phi}(\cdot;x)$ in some filtered probability space $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathscr{F}}, \{\overline{\mathscr{F}_t}\}_{t\geq 0}, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ and for some cylindrical Brownian motion $\overline{W}$ defined on it. Define, for $s \geq 0$, $\overline{u_\phi}(s) = \phi(\overline{X_\phi}(s;x))$ and assume that $\overline{u_\phi}(\cdot) \in \overline{\mathscr{U}_p}$ ([15]). Then $v(x) = \overline{V}(x) = J(x; \overline{u_\phi}(\cdot))$. In particular the couple $(\overline{u_\phi}(\cdot), \overline{X_\phi}(\cdot;x))$ is optimal at x.*

Proof. We prove only the first part as the second follows exactly in the same way varying the filtered probability space and the cylindrical Brownian motion. Consider the couple $(u_\phi(\cdot), X_\phi(\cdot))$ and observe that $X_\phi(\cdot)$ is the unique mild solution (in the strong probabilistic sense) of the state

[14] Weak-mild solution in the terminology of [11].

[15] In the sense that the 6-tuple identified by u_ϕ belongs to $\overline{\mathscr{U}_p}$.

equation associated to the control $u_\phi(\cdot)$, so that $X_\phi(\cdot;x) \equiv X(\cdot;x,u_\phi(\cdot))$. By construction such couple satisfies (5.14). Then, by Theorem 5.5-(ii) we obtain that it is optimal.

Let us address now the uniqueness issue. We observe that, if $(\hat{u}(\cdot), X(\cdot;x,\hat{u}(\cdot)))$ is another optimal couple at x, we immediately have, by (5.11) and the fact that $v(x) = V(x)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s}\left[F_0\left(X(s;x,\hat{u}(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(s;x,\hat{u}(\cdot))\big)\right) - F_{0,CV}\left(X(s;x,\hat{u}(\cdot)), D^G v\big(X(s;x,\hat{u}(\cdot))\big); \hat{u}(s)\right)\right] ds = 0.$$

As the integrand is always negative and as Φ is single-valued, this implies that $\mathbb{P}\times ds$-a.e. we have $\hat{u}(\cdot) = \Phi(X(\cdot;x,\hat{u}(\cdot)))$. This shows that $X(\cdot;x,\hat{u}(\cdot))$ solves (5.19). Then uniqueness of (mild) solutions to (5.19) gives the claim. □

Remark 5.8. *Providing reasonably general conditions on the data that allow to apply the above corollary is a difficult task, as such possibility actually strongly depends on the specific problem at hand. We will provide some results of this kind in the next section.*

6 Examples

In the present section we provide an example of application of our results. It concerns the optimal control of a nonlinear stochastic heat equation in a given space region $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ when the control can be exercised only at the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$. Precisely we consider the cases when the control at the boundary enters through a Neumann-type boundary condition, corresponding to control the heat flow at the boundary.

6.1 Problem setup

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an open, connected, bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with regular (in the sense of [26, Sec. 6]) boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$[16]. We consider the controlled dynamical system driven by the following SPDE in the time interval $[0,+\infty)$:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial s}y(s,\xi) = \Delta y(s,\xi) + \sigma\dot{W}(s,\xi), & (s,\xi)\in[0,+\infty)\times\mathcal{O}, \\ y(0,\xi) = x(\xi), & \xi\in\overline{\mathcal{O}}, \\ \dfrac{\partial y(s,\xi)}{\partial n} = \gamma_0(s,\xi), & (s,\xi)\in[0,+\infty)\times\partial\mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

where:

- $y : [0,+\infty)\times\mathcal{O}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ is a stochastic process describing the evolution of the temperature distribution and is the *state variable* of the system;
- $\gamma_0 : [0,+\infty)\times\partial\mathcal{O}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ is a stochastic process representing the heat flow at the boundary; it is the *control variable* of the system and acts at the boundary of it: this is the reason of the terminology “boundary control";
- n is the outward unit normal vector at the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$;
- $x\in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ is the initial state (initial temperature distribution) in the region $\mathcal{O}$;

[16] We stress that such conditions may allow corners in the boundary: in particular, when $d = 2$ squares satisfy the required regularity.

- W is a cylindrical Wiener process in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$;
- $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{O}))$.

Assume that this equation is well posed (in some suitable sense, see below for the precise setting) for every given $\gamma_0(\cdot,\cdot)$ in a suitable set of admissible control processes $\mathcal{U}^0$ and denote its unique solution by $y^{x,\gamma_0(\cdot,\cdot)}$ to underline the dependence of the state y on the control $\gamma_0(\cdot,\cdot)$ and on the initial datum x. The controller aims at minimizing, over the set $\mathcal{U}^0$, the objective functional

$$I(x;\gamma_0(\cdot,\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s}\left(\int_{\mathcal{O}} \ell_1(y^{x,\gamma_0(\cdot,\cdot)}(s,\xi))d\xi + \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \ell_2(\gamma_0(s,\xi))d\xi\right)ds\right], \tag{6.2}$$

where $\ell_1, \ell_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are given measurable functions bounded from below and $\lambda > 0$ is a discount factor.

6.2 Infinite dimensional setting

We now rewrite the state equation (6.1) and the functional (6.2) in an infinite dimensional setting in the space $H := L^2(\mathcal{O})$. For more details, we refer to [12, Sec. 5] and references therein. Consider the realization of the Laplace operator with vanishing Neumann boundary conditions ([17]):

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}(A_N) := \left\{\phi \in H^2(\mathcal{O}) : \ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}\right\}, \\ A_N\phi := \Delta\phi, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(A_N). \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

It is well-known (see, e.g., [28, Ch. 3]) that A_N generates a strongly continuous analytic semigroup $(e^{tA_N})_{t\geq 0}$ in H. Moreover, A_N is a self-adjoint and dissipative operator. In particular $(0,+\infty) \subset \rho(A_N)$, where $\rho(A_N)$ denotes the resolvent set of A_N. So, if $\delta > 0$, then $(\delta I - A_N)$ is invertible and $(\delta I - A_N)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. Moreover (see, e.g., [26, App. B]) the operator $(\delta I - A_N)^{-1}$ is compact. Consequently, there exists an orthonormal complete sequence $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the operator A_N is diagonal with respect to it:

$$A_N e_k = -\mu_k e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{6.4}$$

for a suitable sequence of eigenvalues $\{\mu_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ repeated according to their multiplicity (they are nonnegative due to dissipativity of A_N). We assume that such sequence is increasingly ordered. Then it is well known that $\mu_0 = 0$ (clearly the constant functions belong to $\mathrm{Ker}(A_N)$) and that $\mu_k > 0$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ (as an immediate consequence of the Gauss-Green formula, only the constant functions belong to $\mathrm{Ker}(A_N)$). Moreover, [36, Sec. 5.6.2, p. 395] (see also [26, App. B]) provides also a growth rate for the sequence of eigenvalues; indeed

$$\mu_k \sim k^{2/d}. \tag{6.5}$$

We have (see, e.g., [26, App. B]) the isomorphic identification

$$\mathcal{D}((\delta I - A_N)^\alpha) = H^{2\alpha}(\mathcal{O}), \quad \forall \alpha \in \left(0, \frac{3}{4}\right), \ \forall \delta > 0, \tag{6.6}$$

where $H^s(\mathcal{O})$ denotes the Sobolev space of exponent $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Next, consider the following problem with Neumann boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w(\xi) = \delta w(\xi), & \xi \in \mathcal{O} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial n} w(\xi) = \alpha(\xi), & \xi \in \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \tag{6.7}$$

[17] To be precise, $\mathcal{D}(A_N)$ is the closure in $H^2(\mathcal{O})$ of the set of functions $\phi \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ having vanishing normal derivative at the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$.

Given any $\delta > 0$ and $\alpha \in L^2(\partial\mathscr{O})$, there exists a unique solution $N_\delta \alpha \in H^{3/2}(\mathscr{O})$ to (6.7). Moreover, the operator (*Neumann map*)

$$N_\delta : L^2(\partial\mathscr{O}) \to H^{3/2}(\mathscr{O}), \tag{6.8}$$

is continuous (see [27, Th. 7.4]). So, in view of (6.6), the map

$$N_\delta : L^2(\partial\mathscr{O}) \to \mathscr{D}((\delta I - A_N)^{\frac{3}{4}-\varepsilon}), \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 3/4), \tag{6.9}$$

is continuous. In [12, Sec. 5], it is shown that the natural abstract reformulation of the original control problem in the space H is

$$\begin{cases} dX(s) = \left[A_N X(s) + G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} \gamma(s)\right] ds + \sigma dW(s), \\ X(0) = x. \end{cases} \tag{6.10}$$

where $L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} := (\delta I - A_N)^{\frac{3}{4}-\varepsilon} N_\delta \in \mathscr{L}(L^2(\partial\mathscr{O}), H)$, $G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} := (\delta I - A_N)^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}$, and $u(t) := \gamma_0(t,\cdot) \in L^2(\partial\mathscr{O})$ for $t \geq 0$. We are now in the framework of (3.1), with $K = H$, $A = A_N$, $G = G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}$, $L = L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}$, and $U = L^2(\partial\mathscr{O})$. Let us consider, as set of admissible controls,

$$\mathscr{U}_p := \left\{ u : [0,+\infty) \times \Omega \to \Lambda : \ u(\cdot) \text{ is } (\mathscr{F}_s)\text{-prog. meas. and s.t. } \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|u(s)|^p_{L_2(\partial\mathscr{O})} ds < +\infty \ \forall t \geq 0 \right\}.$$

where $\Lambda \subseteq L^2(\partial\mathscr{O})$ and p will be specified later according to (3.3). Defining

$$l_1(x) := \int_{\mathscr{O}} \ell_1(x(\xi)) d\xi, \qquad l_2(u) := \int_{\partial\mathscr{O}} \ell_2(u(\xi)) d\xi,$$

and

$$l : H \times \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}, \quad l(x,u) := l_1(x) + l_2(u),$$

the functional I in (6.2) can be rewritten in the Hilbert space setting as

$$J(x;u(\cdot)) := \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda s} l(X(s;x,u(\cdot)), u(s)) ds \right]. \tag{6.11}$$

6.3 HJB equation and verification theorem

Setting $Q := \sigma\sigma^*$, the HJB equation associated to the minimization of (6.11) is

$$\lambda v(x) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}[QD^2 v(x)] + \langle A_N x, Dv(x) \rangle_H + l_1(x) + \inf_{u \in \Lambda} \left\{ \left\langle L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} u, D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v(x) \right\rangle + l_2(u) \right\} = 0. \tag{6.12}$$

Since the semigroup $\{e^{tA_N}\}_{t\geq 0}$ is strongly continuous and analytic, then by [31, Th. 6.13(c)] the operator $e^{sA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}$ can be extended to $\overline{e^{sA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} = G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} e^{sA_N} \in \mathscr{L}(H)$ for every $s > 0$ and

$$\left| \overline{e^{sA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} \right|_{\mathscr{L}(H)} \leq C s^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}, \qquad \forall s > 0. \tag{6.13}$$

Hence, Assumption 3.1(i) and (iii) is satisfied with $A = A_N$, $G = G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}$ and $\beta = \varepsilon + 1/4$. Consequently, recalling (3.3), we choose $p > \frac{1}{\frac{3}{4}-\varepsilon}$. Furthermore, the crucial Assumption 4.8 is verified through Remark 4.9.

Now, assume the following.

(H1) σ satisfies Assumption 3.1(ii).

(H2) Conditions (A1) and (A2) of Remark 5.2 hold true with $G = G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}$.

(H3) $\ell_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, so $l_1 \in C_b(H)$[18]. Moreover the map $q \mapsto F_1(q)$, defined by

$$F_1(q) := \inf_{u\in\Lambda}\left\{\left\langle L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}u, q\right\rangle_H + l_2(u)\right\}, \qquad \forall q \in K,$$

is Lipschitz continuous. Hence $F_0(x,q) = l_1(x)+F_1(q)$ satisfies condition (A3) of Remark 5.2.

Then, under such assumptions, by Remark 5.2, for sufficiently large $\lambda > 0$ there exists a unique mild solution $v \in C_b^{1,G}(H)$. Hence, Theorem 5.5 applies. We now discuss the validity of the above assumptions.

- *On the validity of (H1).* First of all, we note that in Assumption 3.1(ii), we can take γ as small as we want; indeed, if this assumption holds true for some $\bar\gamma \in (0,1/2)$, then it holds true also for all $\gamma \in (0,\bar\gamma)$. By (6.4), the operator e^{tA_N} is diagonal with respect to the orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}$ with eigenvalues $e^{-t\mu_k}$. Hence, Assumption 3.1(ii) rewrites as

$$\int_0^t\left(s^{-2\gamma}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\left\langle e^{sA}Qe^{sA^*}e_k, e_k\right\rangle\right)ds = \int_0^t\left(s^{-2\gamma}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}e^{-2\mu_k s}|\sigma e_k|^2\right)ds < +\infty \ \ \forall t \geq 0. \tag{6.14}$$

Applying Fubini-Tonelli's Theorem, one gets that (6.14) holds true if and only if

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\left(s^{-2\gamma}e^{-2\mu_k s}|\sigma e_k|^2\right)ds < +\infty \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

i.e. if and only if

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}\int_0^t\left(s^{-2\gamma}e^{-2\mu_k s}|\sigma e_k|^2\right)ds < +\infty \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{6.15}$$

Now, calling Γ_E the Euler's gamma function, i.e.

$$\Gamma_E(\alpha) := \int_0^{+\infty} s^{\alpha-1}e^{-s}ds, \ \ \alpha > 0,$$

we estimate

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}\int_0^t\left(s^{-2\gamma}e^{-2\mu_k s}|\sigma e_k|^2\right)ds \leq \Gamma_E(1-2\gamma)\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}\mu_k^{2\gamma-1}|\sigma e_k|^2. \tag{6.16}$$

So, considering (6.5), we see that (6.15) holds if

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} k^{\frac{2(2\gamma-1)}{d}}|\sigma e_k|^2 < +\infty. \tag{6.17}$$

Let $\theta \geq 0$ be such that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\frac{|\sigma e_k|^2}{k^{-2\theta}} < +\infty \tag{6.18}$$

(recall that $\sigma \in \mathscr{L}(H)$, so $\theta = 0$ always verifies (6.18)). Considering that γ can be taken as small as we want and combining (6.17) and (6.18), we conclude that (H1) holds if we may take in (6.18)

$$\theta > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{d}. \tag{6.19}$$

In particular, if $d = 1$, then (H1) holds true for all $\sigma \in \mathscr{L}(H)$.

[18] According to Remark 4.17 it is possible to deal with the case when ℓ_1, and so l_1, has polynomial growth.

- *On the validity of (H2).* By (6.5), we have

$$G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} e_k = (\delta I - A_N)^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon} e_k = g_k e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where

$$g_k := \left(\delta + \mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The operator $\overline{e^{tA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}}$ is diagonal too with respect to $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and

$$\overline{e^{tA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} e_k = e^{-\mu_k t} g_k e_k = e^{-\mu_k t} \left(\delta + \mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon} e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6.20}$$

Assume now further that $\sigma \in \mathscr{L}(H)$ is diagonal with respect to $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and nondegenerate:

$$\sigma e_k = \sigma_k e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\sigma_k > 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $q_k := \sigma_k^2 > 0$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$e^{sA_N} Q e^{sA_N^*} e_k = e^{-2s\mu_k} q_k e_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},\ s > 0.$$

In this case $Q_t := \int_0^t e^{sA_N} Q e^{sA_N^*} ds$ is diagonal too and

$$Q_t e_k = \begin{cases} t q_k e_k & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \frac{q_k}{2\mu_k}(1 - e^{-2\mu_k t}) e_k, & \text{if } k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{cases} \qquad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Hence, we have, with the agreement $\frac{1-e^{-2\mu_k t}}{2\mu_k} := t$ if $k = 0$, we have

$$\Gamma_G(t) e_k := Q_t^{-1/2} \overline{e^{tA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} e_k = \sqrt{\frac{2\mu_k}{(1 - e^{-2t\mu_k}) q_k}}\ e^{-\mu_k t} \left(\delta + \mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon} e_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that

$$|\Gamma_G(t)|_{\mathscr{L}(H)} = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} |\Gamma_G(t) e_k| = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\frac{2\mu_k \left(\delta + \mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(e^{2t\mu_k} - 1) q_k}}.$$

So, with the agreement that $\frac{2\mu_k}{e^{2t\mu_k}-1} := t^{-1}$ if $k = 0$, conditions (A1) and (A2) of Remark 5.2 hold true if and only if

$$\begin{gathered} \exists \eta \in L^1_{loc}([0,+\infty);\mathbb{R}) \text{ bounded in a neighborhood of } +\infty \text{ s.t.} \\ \sqrt{\frac{2\mu_k \left(\delta + \mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(e^{2t\mu_k} - 1) q_k}} \leq \eta(t), \quad \forall t > 0,\ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{gathered} \tag{6.21}$$

Assume that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{q_k}{k^{-2\theta}} > 0 \ \text{ for some } \theta \geq 0, \tag{6.22}$$

and let $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_0 > 0$ be such that $q_k \geq c_0 k^{-2\theta}$ for some $c_0 > 0$ and every $k \geq k_0$. Considering (6.5), let $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $k_0' \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$c_1 k^{\frac{2}{d}} \leq \mu_k \leq c_2 k^{\frac{2}{d}}, \quad \forall k \geq k_0'.$$

Calling $\bar{k} := k_0 \vee k_0'$ it is clear that, for a suitable $C_0 > 0$,

$$\sup_{k<\bar{k}} \sqrt{\frac{2\mu_k \left(\delta+\mu_k\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(e^{2t\mu_k}-1)q_k}} \le C_0 t^{-1/2}.$$

Hence, to prove (6.21) above, we take $k \ge \bar{k}$ and we rewrite (6.21) (up to a constant depending on c_0, c_1, c_2) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists \eta \in L^1_{loc}([0,+\infty);\mathbb{R}) \text{ bounded in a neighborhood of } +\infty \text{ s.t.} \\ &\sqrt{\frac{k^{\frac{2}{d}}\left(\delta+k^{\frac{2}{d}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(e^{2tk^{\frac{2}{d}}}-1)k^{-2\theta}}} \le \eta(t), \quad \forall t>0,\ \forall k \ge \bar{k}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

Noting that $C_1 := \sup_{s>0} \frac{s^{\frac{3}{2}+2\varepsilon+d\theta}}{e^s-1} < +\infty$, we can estimate

$$\frac{k^{\frac{2}{d}}\left(\delta+k^{\frac{2}{d}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(e^{2tk^{\frac{2}{d}}}-1)k^{-2\theta}} \le \frac{(1+\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}k^{\frac{2}{d}(\frac{3}{2}+2\varepsilon)+2\theta}}{(e^{2tk^{\frac{2}{d}}}-1)} \le C_1 \frac{(1+\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon}}{(2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+2\varepsilon+d\theta}} \quad \forall k \ge \bar{k}.$$

Therefore, (H2) is satisfied whenever (6.22) holds for some θ such that $\frac{3}{2}+2\varepsilon+d\theta<2$. As $\varepsilon>0$ can be taken arbitrarily small, we conclude that (H2) can be fulfilled if (6.22) holds for some θ such that

$$\frac{3}{2}+d\theta<2 \iff \theta<\frac{1}{2d}. \tag{6.24}$$

- *On the simultaneous validity of (H1)–(H2).* Looking at (6.19) and (6.24), we see that (H1)-(H2) can be simultaneously fulfilled by choosing a suitable $\varepsilon>0$ if σ is diagonal with respect to $\{e_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and (6.22) is verified for some $\theta \ge 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{d}<\theta<\frac{1}{2d}. \tag{6.25}$$

  These requirements can be fulfilled only for dimension $d \le 2$.

- *On the validity of (H3).* We notice that it is guaranteed, for instance, if

  - Λ is bounded;
  - ℓ_1 is continuous and bounded;
  - ℓ_2 is measurable.

6.4 Optimal Feedback Controls

In the framework of the previous subsection, we look now at the existence of optimal feedback controls.

Theorem 6.1. *Let (H1)–(H3) of the previous subsection hold. Assume that the multi-valued map*

$$\Psi : H \to \Lambda,\ \ q \mapsto argmin_{u\in\Lambda}\left\{\left\langle L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}u, q\right\rangle_H + l_2(u)\right\} \tag{6.26}$$

admits a Lipschitz continuous selection ψ and that $D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}}v$ is Lipschitz continuous. Set $\phi := \psi \circ D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}}v$. Then the SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX(s) = \left[A_N X(s) + G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon} L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\phi(X(s)))\right] ds + \sigma dW(s) \\ X(0) = x, \end{cases} \tag{6.27}$$

admits a unique mild solution $X_\phi(\cdot;x) \in \mathscr{K}^{1,loc}_{\mathscr{P}}(H)$ *(in the sense of* (5.19)*) admitting a version with continuous trajectories. As a consequence, Corollary 5.7(i) applies providing the optimality of the couple* $(u_\phi(\cdot), X_\phi(\cdot;x))$*, where* $u_\phi(s) := \phi(X_\phi(s;x))$*.*

Proof. By the assumptions, the map ϕ is Lipschitz continuous too. Then the claim follows by a standard result of existence and uniqueness of SDEs in infinite dimension, see e.g. [8, Theorem 7.5]. □

The assumption that Ψ defined in (6.26) admits a Lipschitz continuous selection ψ is guaranteed, for example, if $\Lambda = U$, $l_2 : U \to \mathbb{R}$ is strictly convex,

$$\lim_{|u|_U \to +\infty} \frac{l_2(u)}{|u|_U} = +\infty,$$

l_2 is Fréchet differentiable and Dl_2 has Lipschitz continuous inverse. Indeed in this case the infimum in (6.26) is uniquely achieved (in particular Ψ is single-valued) at

$$u^*(q) = (Dl_2)^{-1}\left(\left(L_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}\right)^* q\right), \quad q \in H.$$

Hence, if we are able to check that $D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v$ is Lipschitz continuous, we can then apply Corollary 5.7(i) in its strongest form to get uniqueness of the optimal control constructed. On the other hand, checking that $D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v$ is Lipschitz continuous might be, in general, a very difficult task[19], whereas mere continuity of $D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v$ is a condition already "contained" in the definition of mild solution.

For this reason it is significant to provide a Peano type result[20] of existence of mild solutions in infinite dimension eventually exploiting the fact that, as in the example we are considering here, the semigroup $\{e^{sA_N}\}_{s\geq 0}$ in the definition of mild solution to (6.27) is compact as it is diagonal and the sequence of eigenvalues is infinitesimal. This allows to cover the case when a selection ψ of Ψ in (6.26) is known to be only continuous and bounded on bounded sets. In this case, as $D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}}$ is continuous and bounded by construction, with these assumptions the map $\psi \circ D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v$ is continuous and has at most linear growth. Then, martingale solutions to (6.27) can be actually constructed as in [5, Prop. 3] (see also [17]) getting the following result, whose proof we omit for brevity as it closely follows the arguments of the aforementioned references; here we only need to take care of dealing with $\overline{e^{sA_N} G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}}$ in place of e^{sA_N} 1in the convolution term.

Theorem 6.2. *Let (H1)–(H3) of the previous subsection hold. Assume that the multi-valued map* (6.26) *admits a continuous selection with at most linear growth on bounded sets and set* $\phi := \psi \circ D^{G_N^{\delta,\varepsilon}} v$*. Then* (6.27) *has a martingale solution* $\overline{X_\phi}(\cdot;x)$ *in some filtered probability space* $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathscr{F}}, \{\overline{\mathscr{F}_t}\}_{t\geq 0}, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ *and for some cylindrical Brownian motion* $\overline{W}$ *defined on it. As a consequence, Corollary 5.7(ii) applies providing the optimality of the couple* $(\overline{u_\phi}(\cdot), \overline{X_\phi}(\cdot;x))$*, where* $\overline{u}_\phi(s) := \phi(\overline{X_\phi}(s;x))$*.*

Remark 6.3. *The method of proof of results like the above Theorem 6.2 relies on the use of the so-called Skorohod representation theorem. This explains the need of dealing with martingale solutions, i.e. of constructing the solution on a probability space* $\overline{\Omega}$ *which is not the original one of the definition of the problem. In the specific case we are handling, where the diffusion term is just additive in the equation, a way to construct the solution in the original probability*

[19] This can be done assuming more regularity of ℓ_1 — hence of l_1 — and proving a suitable C^2 property of v. See, e.g., the approach used in [22] or in [21].

[20] This is not straightforward: in infinite dimension Peano's Theorem fails in general (see [19]).

space Ω would consist in constructing a pathwise solution dealing with a parameterized family of deterministic problems with parameter $\omega \in \Omega$ (see [1], [7, Sections 14.2 and 15.2], [14], [29]). Once this is done, the problem is to prove that the family of solutions constructed ω by ω admits an adapted selection. The existence of a selection which is measurable with respect to $\mathscr{F}$ can be obtained using measurable selection theorems (see again [1]); proving that this selection is also adapted is a problematic task, which is still open. In the case when one knows ex ante that the pathwise solution is unique for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, then F. Flandoli (personal communication) showed us how to accomplish this task. Unfortunately, in our case, the uniqueness of the solutions of the deterministic equations for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ only holds when the properties of the coefficients allow to find directly mild solutions to SDE (6.27).

References

[1] A. Bensoussan and R. Temam. Équations stochastiques du type Navier-Stokes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 13(2):195–222, 1973.

[2] S. Cerrai. A Hille-Yosida theorem for weakly continuous semigroups. *Semigroup Forum*, 49(3):349–367, 1994.

[3] S. Cerrai. Stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces and applications to a stochastic optimal control problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 40(3):824–852, 2001.

[4] S. Cerrai and F. Gozzi. Strong solutions of Cauchy problems associated to weakly continuous semigroups. *Differential Integral Equations*, 8(3):465–486, 1995.

[5] A. Chojnowska-Michalik and B. Gołdys. Existence, uniqueness and invariant measures for stochastic semilinear equations on Hilbert spaces. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 102(3):331–356, 1995.

[6] G. Da Prato and A. Lunardi. On the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator in spaces of continuous functions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 131(1):94–114, 1995.

[7] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[8] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 152. Cambridge university press, 2014.

[9] N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz. *Linear operators. Part I*. Interscience, New York, 1958.

[10] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes. Characterization and convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, New York, 1986.

[11] G. Fabbri, F. Gozzi, and A. Święch. *Stochastic Optimal Control in Infinite Dimensions: Dynamic Programming and HJB Equations*. Stochastic Modeling and Applied Probability. Springer, New York, first edition, 2017.

[12] S. Federico and F. Gozzi. Mild solution of semilinear elliptic equations in Hilbert spaces. *Submitted (arXiv preprint)*, 2016.

[13] S. Federico and M. Rosestolato. C_0-sequentially equicontinuous semigroups in locally convex spaces and application to Markov transition semigroups. *Submitted (arXiv preprint)*, 2016.

[14] F. Flandoli and B. Schmalfuss. Weak solutions and attractors for three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations with nonregular force. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 11(2):355–398, 1999.

[15] G. B. Folland. *Real analysis*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley, New York, second edition, 1999.

[16] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore. Infinite horizon backward stochastic differential equations and elliptic equations in Hilbert spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1B):607–660, 2004.

[17] D. Gątarek and B. Goldys. On invariant measures for diffusions on Banach spaces. *Potential Anal.*, 7(2):533–553, 1997.

[18] L. Gawarecki and V. Mandrekar. *Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensions with applications to stochastic partial differential equations*. Probability and its Applications. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[19] A.N. Godunov. On peano's theorem in banach spaces. *Functional Analysis and Applications*, 9(1):53–55, 1975.

[20] F. Gozzi. Regularity of solutions of a second order Hamilton-Jacobi equation and application to a control problem. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(5-6):775–826, 1995.

[21] F. Gozzi and F. Masiero. Stochastic optimal control with delay in the control I: solving the HJB equation through partial smoothing. Preprint arXiv:1607.06502v1, 2016.

[22] F. Gozzi and E. Rouy. Regular solutions of second-order stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 130(1):201–234, 1996.

[23] F. Gozzi and F. Russo. Verification theorems for stochastic optimal control problems via a time dependent Fukushima-Dirichlet decomposition. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 116(11):1530–1562, 2006.

[24] F. Gozzi, A. Święch, and X. Y. Zhou. A corrected proof of the stochastic verification theorem within the framework of viscosity solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 43(6):2009–2019, 2005.

[25] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 1988.

[26] I. Lasiecka. Unified theory for abstract parabolic boundary problems - a semigroup approach. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 6(1):287–333, 1980.

[27] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications*, volume 1. Springer, Berlin, 1972.

[28] A. Lunardi. *Analytic semigroups and optimal regularity in parabolic problems*, volume 16 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.

[29] R. Mikulevicius and B.L. Rozovsky. Global l2-solutions of stochastic navierstokes equations. *The Annals of Prob.*, 33(1):137–176, 2005.

[30] É. Pardoux and S. Peng. Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications (Charlotte, NC, 1991)*, volume 176 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pages 200–217. Springer, Berlin, 1992.

[31] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 1983.

[32] E. Priola. On a class of Markov type semigroups in spaces of uniformly continuous and bounded functions. *Studia Math.*, 136(3):271–295, 1999.

[33] E. Priola. *Partial differential equations with infinitely many variables*. PhD thesis, Tesi di Dottorato, Universita degli Studi di Milano, 1999.

[34] E. Priola. The Cauchy problem for a class of Markov-type semigroups. *Commun. Appl. Anal.*, 5(1):49–76, 2001.

[35] B. Reed M., Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, I: Functional Analysis*. Academic Press Inc., San Diego, 1980.

[36] H. Triebel. *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*. VEB Deutsehen Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1978.

[37] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou. *Stochastic controls, Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, volume 43 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 1999.